



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/535,984      | 03/27/2000  | Toshiro Obitsu       | 1614.1045           | 4143             |

21171 7590 12/03/2002

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
700 11TH STREET, NW  
SUITE 500  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

TRUJILLO, JAMES K

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2185

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/535,984

Applicant(s)

OBITSU, TOSHIRO

Examiner

James K. Trujillo

Art Unit

2185

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The office acknowledges the receipt of the following and placed of record in the file: IDS dated 3/27/00, CFR dated 7/13/00, Priority Paper dated 8/1/00, CFR dated 7/13/00, and Change of Address dated 12/28/00
2. Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3, 6-15, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakashima, U.S. Patent 6,029,211.
5. As to claim 1, Nakashima taught an electronic apparatus for realizing a desired function by combining a plurality of units comprising:

a judging part judging whether a combination of the plurality of units is to realize the desired function [a judging part ("controller") selects combinations of functions within a PC card are selected to enable a PC card to realize a function, col. 5 lines 16-23 and col. 5 lines 41-53];

a power supply control part controlling a supply of power from a power source to at least one of said units of said combination used to realize said desired function based on a judgment result of the judging part [only desired functions are supplied with power ("activated") col. 2 lines 25-28].

In summary, Nakashima defines functions to be carried out within a multifunction PC card. When the PC card carries out a multifunction a controller selects a combination of functions used to perform the multifunction. Nakashima further taught that only selected functions are enabled ("activated") to reduce power consumption.

6. As to claim 2, Nakashima taught an electronic apparatus as in claim 1 further comprising:

an identification information obtaining part obtaining identification information for identifying from said plurality of units [the CISs obtain information for identifying a plurality of units ("functions"), which are then selected by a controller, col. 5 lines 41-53];

an information judging part judging whether said desired function is realized based on the identification information obtained from said plurality of units [the controller determines how the overall function is realized, col. 5 lines 41-53].

7. As to claim 3, Nakashima taught that the plurality of units are detachable [the units reside on a PC card which may be inserted or removed from a slot of a computer removing the plurality of units, col. 5 lines 4-15].

8. As to claim 6, Nakashima disclosed that his invention is desired in electronic apparatuses where the power source is a battery unit [col. 1 line 61 through col. 2 line 3]

9. As to claim 7, Nakashima taught an electronic apparatus connectable to a plurality of units comprising:

a judging part judging whether a combination of at least two of a plurality of units is a predetermined combination [a judging part ("controller") selects combinations of functions within a PC card are selected to enable a PC card to realize a function, for a given function the same units must work together and are thus predetermined, col. 5 lines 16-23 and col. 5 lines 41-53];

a power source control part stopping a supply of power to at least one unit in the combination when said judging part judges that the combination is the predetermined combination [desired units ("functions") are selectively activated suggesting that units not desired are deactivated implying that the power supply is stopped to undesired units, col. 2 lines 25-28].

10. As to claim 8, Nakashima taught a judging part comprising a table storing predetermined combinations of the plurality of units judging part judges whether the combination is one of the predetermined combinations based on the table [col. 5 line 58 through col. 6 line 9]. Specifically Nakashima stores functional attribute information in a region of data having a table ("data array structure"). A data array structure is interpreted to a table because a table is an array type structure.

11. As to claim 9, it is rejected on the same basis as set forth hereinabove.

12. As to claims 10, 11-15, 18 and 19, they are rejected on the same basis as set forth hereinabove.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakashima, U.S. Patent 6,029,211.

15. As to claim 4, Nakashima taught an electronic apparatus comprising a judging part identifying type of device unit and a type of PC card [col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 lines 61-64]. Nakashima taught that information for a specific PC card is available for the computer to read. In order for the computer to carry out a function the computer must identify the PC card to be used because an artisan would have recognized that computer systems often use more than one PC card to expand their functionality. In Nakashima a PC card is select to carry out a function an artisan would have recognized that PC cards are used to operate devices such as peripherals. In order to operate the correct device the appropriate device must be identified.

Nakashima also does not expressly disclose the power supply control part stopping the supply of power to the card when the judging part judges that the device unit does not use the PC card. In summary, Nakashima discloses activating only the

desired function selectively to reduce power consumption, suggesting that power is stopped to unused functioning blocks [col. 2 lines 25-28].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nakashima by stopping power the entire PC card when it is judged that no function on that particular PC card is used because the PC card contains multiple functions used to carry out operations for the computer. One would have been motivated to do so because this would further reduce power consumption since the entire PC card is prevented for consuming power.

16. As to claim 16, it is rejected on the same basis as set forth hereinabove.

17. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakashima as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Beatty, U.S. Patent 5,781,798.

18. As to claim 5, Nakashima does not expressly disclose stopping the supply of power to the PC card when the PC card is used with the desired device but the desired device is not connected.

Beatty taught a PC card with socket service software to detect if a device is connected to the card [col. 5 lines 39-41]. Using the teachings of Beatty to detect if a device is connected to the card combined with Nakashima for stopping the supply of power to functions not used within a card it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nakashima to detect if a device is connected to a card and if a device is not connected to the card stop the power supply

to the card because both inventions are involve using a PC card to provide functionality. One would have been motivated to stop the power supply to a card when the desired device is not connected because this would provide the result of further saving power when a function is not required which is highly desirable in the environment of Nakashima.

19. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakashima as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Beatty, U.S. Patent 5,781,798.

20. As to claim 17, it is rejected on the same basis as set forth hereinabove.

### ***Conclusion***

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,613,159 to Colnot. This patent taught a system wherein a memory card is not provided with power unless it has been activated.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,935,228 to Shinomura. This patent taught a system wherein if a PC card is removed the power supply to it is stopped.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,452,256 to Ichikawa. This patent taught a system wherein a power supply to a card is provided selectively on when the card is activated.

U.S. Pat. No. 4,507,697 to Ozil et al. This patent taught a system wherein if a PC card is removed the power supply to it is stopped.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James K. Trujillo whose telephone number is (703) 308-




6291. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 am - 5:00 pm) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Lee can be reached on (703) 305-9717. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

James Trujillo  
November 29, 2002



THOMAS LEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100